THEOLOGY

VOL. XLIX AUGUST, 1946 No. 314

Justice and Mercy[1]

Matthew vii, 1: "Judge not, that ye be not judged."

SELF-INTEREST is a key word of our post-war world. An insistence, sometimes open, sometimes implied, on self-interest as a value upon which thought and action should be based is a commonplace to-day in both Church and Commonwealth. If we were to believe the Press and many public utterances of men of affairs in the world to-day we might suppose that self-interest is a virtue and mercy a vice. By self-interest I mean the conscious putting of one's own interest before that of another. For there is a sense in which self-interest could be a virtue: the sense in which it could mean an interest to make one's self what it ought to be, what God would have it be. But such self-interest, implied in the commandment "Love your neighbour as yourself," is not what is commonly meant when we use the expression.

It is in the field of international affairs that the homage to self-interest is most evident—national self-interests are the greatest barrier against which the dove of peace is battering itself to death. How clearly, for example, do we see day by day the attitudes of the so-called Big Three to problems concerning their treatment of our late enemies defined in terms, not of mercy, but of selfish fears and claims: and good men find it expedient to justify good intentions by the pretence that they serve sectional self-interests.

But the most dreadful aspect of this dark picture is the fact that justice is being harnessed to the claims of self-interest. Justice is increasingly being taken to mean what is to the interest of the more powerful: not yet, thank God, in this country in domestic affairs. But in external matters, both in the popular fancy and also in official practice, this process is taking place—in popular fancy we see attempts to justify a vindictive attitude towards other nations, particularly our late enemies, by supposing they receive their just due; and in official practice we claim the sanction of law to vindicate our demands as victors in war.

"Judge not, that ye be not judged": this saying of Christ will give us the clue whereby we may understand the true meaning of justice, and thereby, perhaps, save the world from the terrible effects which must follow from harnessing justice to self-interest. What, then, is the clue? Is it not that justice may never be separated from mercy? For justice is a right relationship between man and man, a covenant, founded upon a knowledge of the righteousness of God and the sonship of all men with Him; it presupposes the relationship between God and His world. But the relationship between God and the world is one of love within which justice plays its part as a tutor to lead men to love

[1] Sermon preached at St Mary's, Oxford, for the Assize, on May 14, 1946.

God. So, then, in covenants between men, in social and political and international relationships, justice may never be absolute: it must only be a tutor, a tutor to create conditions in which love, of which mercy and pity are handmaids, can operate freely. Let no man therefore judge another—and no nation another—if such judgment claims any other sanction than God's; and no judgment can claim God's sanction which is not a pathway to mercy and love or which serves self-interests or which claims human sovereignty.

International justice, too, like any other justice, must be founded upon an understanding of Jesus' saying "Judge not, that ye be not judged." Else it must inevitably go the whole way down the slippery slope upon which it is already set. For where it is made to serve national self-interest it is already denying the sovereignty of God and its own proper function as a restraining arm to prevent the destruction of God's purpose of love for the world—whether through the anarchy of individualism or the totalitarianism of States. Justice and mercy must go hand in hand; else justice becomes the tool of the Devil to destroy its advocates and to lead the nations once again to war.

Let us, then, see the danger signal before it is too late. That we are already playing the Devil's game is evident, for example, at Nuremberg to-day. For it is a justice that allows victor nations to control in all its aspects a trial of war criminals of the vanquished nations against which the words of Jesus are surely a warning. At Nuremberg we find the victors claiming the right to try the vanquished by laws which did not exist when the stated offences took place. But, men say, is it not just to try those who made aggressive and total war? Is it not just to punish for their crimes those who were responsible for Belsen and Buchenwald and other horror camps? And are we not justly setting up standards of international law by which men in future may be tried should they offend them? Maybe yes: but on what principles of justice does the victor become both judge and prosecutor of the vanquished? By all means let us try those who made aggressive and total war possible; but let us try all of them, not Germans only, but Britons and Americans and Russians as well. Let us arraign before the courts those responsible for concentration camps and cruelties within them; but let us arraign them of whatever nationality they may be and not only because they put people into a concentration camp for a reason unacceptable to the ideologies of the victor nations. And let us, by all means, set up standards of international justice; but let them be international. Surely the cause of international justice would have been better served at Nuremberg if a neutral judge and jury had been called upon to try the accused—perhaps a Swiss aware of his country's reactions to the dropping of the atomic bombs. And better still would it have been served if similar courts had been set up in all the belligerent countries for the trial of any accused of war crimes. Nuremberg would stand out as a witness to our concern for international law were the world to see our readiness for justice to be administered both for the victor and the vanquished.

Only if justice in the field of international affairs as well as in national life is cut free from self-interest and is linked fast to mercy shall we

return to a safe road towards peace. Justice must be based firmly upon the sanctions of God's loving authority; it must be administered in the sure knowledge of man's fallible judgments. Only when justice goes hand in hand with mercy can we avoid the awful condemnation and wrath of God's judgment which, Jesus promised, should fall upon those who judge arrogantly, unmercifully or out of self-interest.

L. J. Collins.

Zeger Bernhard Van Espen—II

The previous article has already laid down the spirit in which Van Espen approached his work as a canonist: "I thought it would not be useless . . . if I published some treatises in which I tried, by separating the certain matters from the doubtful, to explain the ancient and the modern disciplines and show how far the two could be reconciled." Two works of Van Espen's show this principle in operation—his most extensive writing, the *Jus ecclesiasticum universum*, and the almost equally important series of Commentaries and Dissertations on the canons of early Councils and the various collections of Canon Law. It may be remarked in passing that from the point of view of the historian of Canon Law this series is still worthy of careful study, for, although the textual side of it is based on the writings of earlier scholars, notably Quesnel, Baluze and Peter de Marca, yet the whole is expressed with such clarity and brevity and the comments upon the subject-matter are so much to the point that there is hardly a page which is without interest.

As a good canonist Van Espen emphasizes the importance of the study of his subject, by which he means study of the sacred canons and decrees of the Fathers. This study, he maintains, is most profitable for the formation of clerical discipline and behaviour and a much better foundation for theology than the books of the casuists. He recognizes, of course, that the circumstances of his day are not those of the Patristic age and that the Church has rightly moderated the rigour of the ancient canons; but he maintains that their study is important because it brings clearly before men the principles of ecclesiastical discipline. It is, in fact, the spirit rather than the words of the law which is to be considered. Van Espen takes a text from the civilians, *scire leges, non est verba earum tenere, sed vim et potestatem*, and he comments: "Truly if we attend to the words of the canon only and to the bare external discipline of the Church contained therein it will often happen that nothing profitable to morals, and which the Church principally intends, will appear, but if the opinion and intimate meaning of the Fathers of the Church as they appear in those canons are looked into, the most holy and useful rules of behaviour will be discovered contained in them."

Van Espen is not, however, content with the discipline of his own day. He thinks it defective in several respects. We noted in the previous article his attack upon some of the new devotions. In his Dissertation on the Canonical Hours he deplores the custom which has grown up

of saying that a layman has discharged his religious obligations on Sundays and Festivals if he hears a Mass and that possibly only a private Mass. Van Espen thinks that the laity should be urged to attend also the other offices of the Church. This is for him one of the many ways in which ancient discipline has been too much relaxed. Nevertheless he is not a rigorist. He thinks that the ancient discipline should be somewhat restored, but with prudence and economy—an excess of zeal may do more harm than good. Ecclesiastical superiors should be very flexible in their administration of the law, considering always the good of souls. The Church is accustomed to mitigate without abrogating the rigour of its discipline.

Van Espen is, however, conscious that in many ways the ancient discipline of the Church has been rather destroyed than mitigated and that new forms have imposed themselves which cannot be regarded as based on catholic authority and primitive tradition, and these evils he ascribes principally to the forgeries which have crept into the Canon Law from the time of the False Decretals onwards. It is one of his merits that he always attempts to distinguish clearly between the false and authentic elements in the various collections of Canon Law and to give a picture of the Law before it submitted to the influence of forgeries. He finds the tenth-century Collection of Regino, Abbot of Prüm, particularly interesting as showing, in the period of transition, the difference between the old and new disciplines, but his closest examination is reserved for the Decretum of Gratian. Here he follows in the steps of Antonius Augustinus, Baluze, de Marca, and other commentators of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, separating carefully the authentic from the spurious and detecting the mutilations and omissions in those texts which are otherwise genuine. Van Espen recognizes that very little of this falsity was Gratian's own work, that the trouble really begins with the forgeries of the mid-ninth century and the well-meaning but disastrous attempts at reform of Burchard of Worms; but Gratian is not to be acquitted entirely, and the term *inepte* is applied frequently to his comments. The man who could take the celebrated African canon forbidding appeals across the sea and write after it as a gloss or explanation *Nisi forte Romanam sedem appellaverint* fully deserves to be called *ineptus*.

Van Espen as a canonist is naturally more concerned with discipline than with doctrine, but he is never oblivious of the connexion between the two. One is reminded of his comments on Gratian and the False Decretals by reading Dom Gregory Dix's remarks on the same subject in his recent lecture on Confirmation. One cannot pretend that Van Espen was sufficiently independent of his age to have anticipated all our difficulties in regard to Christian initiation, but at least his discussion of Baptism and Confirmation in the *Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum* shows him to have been fully aware of the primitive practice and to have insisted much more than some of his contemporaries on the necessity of Confirmation. His likening of the baptized but unconfirmed Christian to the enrolled but unarmed soldier is perhaps as good an analogy as any that this unhappy subject has produced.

It is, however, the growth of papal power and the centralizing of

ecclesiastical authority at Rome which Van Espen regards as the worst result of the canonical forgeries. He was, as we have pointed out earlier, Gallican in his sympathies, but he was not aggressive in temper. In the *Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum* he avoids any full discussion of papal infallibility, or of the superiority of popes over councils, or of the temporal power of the papacy. He frequently expresses his reverence for the see of Rome and his sense of the obedience due to the Pope, but he was prepared to distinguish clearly between this and unquestioning acceptance of all decrees emanating from the Roman congregations. Moreover, as circumstances showed, he was of the number of those who considered that the divine rights of the bishops were menaced by the juridical powers ascribed to the Pope since the eleventh and twelfth centuries. This view is perhaps expounded most fully in the *Vindiciæ Resolutionis Doctorum Lovaniensium super Quæstione de subsistentia Ecclesiæ Ultrajectensis ejusque Episcopis et Capitulo*, where he defends the rights of the Dutch hierarchy against the attempted suppression of the see of Utrecht by Rome. He discusses at some length the *plenitudo potestatis* which, it was alleged, empowered the Pope to establish or suppress sees at will. Van Espen has little difficulty in showing this not to be in accord with primitive discipline, and he contends that it was introduced in the course of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. This is in the first disquisition. A little later, in the *Disquisitio Secunda*, he has to return to the subject of the *plenitudo potestatis* in examining the contention that the Pope is the proper, ordinary, and immediate Pastor of the Church of Utrecht—the words remind us of the Vatican decrees. Here he asserts that all bishops are the Vicars of Christ, that all share in the commission to keep the keys and to feed the flock, that all are co-ministers, co-bishops with the Roman Pontiff, and he refutes strenuously the doctrine that the Pope alone is the fount of all jurisdiction in the Church.

It is characteristic of Van Espen that he never speaks with the slightest disrespect of the popes of that period which he regards as fatal in the history of Canon Law. Gregory VII and Innocent III appear frequently in his writings, and their responsibility for the development of the doctrine of the *plenitudo potestatis* is noted; but at the same time their greatness is recognized, and Van Espen is at pains to point out how they were in keeping with the sentiments of their age and how no one had then detected the existence of the canonical forgeries. Truly with him one does not know which to admire the more, the depth of his learning or the moderation of his criticism.

The development of papal power and the conflict between Church and State are historically closely allied. It was natural that Van Espen as a critic of papal despotism should also be a champion of the rights of princes. In a letter addressed to the Emperor in 1719 he says that a constant source of pain to him in forty years' study of the canons had been to discover in modern authors an excessive desire to establish principles contrary to the most sacred rights of princes and to extend, in prejudice to those rights, ecclesiastical jurisdiction far beyond its proper bounds. "From this," he writes, "have arisen frequent conflicts of jurisdictions, and clashes between the *Sacerdotium* and the *Imperium*,

which have not only disturbed the public peace but have sometimes been the cause of the gravest disasters in kingdoms and empires." He says that his *Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum* was written partly as an attempt to elucidate the problems involved, but two other of his works deal more specifically with spheres in which Church and State were in conflict in his day. They are the *Tractatus de Promulgatione legum ecclesiasticarum, ac speciatim Bullarum et Rescriptorum Curiæ Romanæ; ubi et de Placito Regio, quod ante eorum publicationem et executionem in Provinciis requiritur*, published in 1712 and condemned by the Inquisition in 1714, and the *Tractatus de Recursu ad Principem*, published in 1725. The principle at the root of both treatises is that the secular ruler has the unavoidable duty of maintaining peace and assuring justice to his subjects. In the first Van Espen argues that laws do not bind until they are promulgated and that ecclesiastical laws, like civil laws, ought to be promulgated in all the provinces to which they apply. The bishops as pastors and teachers have the responsibility and right of promulgation, but they ought also to be consulted as the same law is not always suitable for all countries, and it is desirable that laws should be peaceably and willingly obeyed. Van Espen quotes the principle: *Certum est, Legem nullam vim obtinere, si ab initio rejecta fuerit a subditis. Nam maxime præsumendum est, eam Legem quæ a Republica non recipitur, ei non convenire.* But princes have also a right that ecclesiastical laws should be submitted to them before being promulgated in their dominions, and that such laws should not be promulgated without the royal approval or *Placet*. Van Espen shows that this has been the custom in Belgium for about 200 years, and also prevails in other countries, notably France, Spain, Savoy, and Naples. The purpose of the *Placet* is to see that the peace of the kingdom is not disturbed by papal bulls and rescripts. The prince has a duty of supporting ecclesiastical discipline by his authority, but also of protecting his subjects against injustice and violence, and this duty he cannot give up without violating his proper authority.

The *Placet*, says Van Espen, applies to all general laws, and he maintains that not even the decrees of the Council of Trent were received in Belgium and France without it. It is particularly necessary in the case of decrees condemning writings. These decrees are usually drawn up on the evidence of a few theologians and cardinals to whom the task of examining suspected books is committed. Theologians, especially the regulars who cling to the opinions of their own masters, are apt to be very fixed in their opinions and to condemn in violent terms the views of others. Moreover, it is the practice nowadays not to specify the grounds of condemnation, and this gives rise to heated discussion as to the faults of any particular work. Finally, a book may cause offence in a country where there are many heretics and yet be harmless or even profitable in another land untouched by heresy. For all these reasons it is desirable that the prince in the interests of public peace should be particularly careful about the admission of decrees condemning books. Part five of the treatise discusses the *Placet* as applied to dogmatic bulls. Van Espen points out that the giving or withholding of it cannot affect the truth of the doctrine contained in such bulls or the internal assent given by the

faithful to that doctrine; but princes may rightly concern themselves with the imposition of professions of faith and with clauses in dogmatic bulls which attack the rights of states—as, for example, clauses providing for the summoning of violators of the decrees to courts outside the realm or setting up new courts not hitherto received, such as the Inquisition. Popes, he says, are, after all, human, and may be led by wicked flatterers into inserting clauses into dogmatic bulls which prejudice the ancient customs and privileges of states. The use of the *Placet* does not tend to hinder ecclesiastical jurisdiction or to weaken the authority of the Pope, but only to prevent what neither the Pope nor the Church intended, that the Church or the State should suffer disturbance through the precipitate execution of these decrees.

In the *De Recursu ad Principem* Van Espen is concerned with appeals to the State for protection against injustice in the ecclesiastical forum. It must be remembered that in his day ecclesiastical proceedings were much more frequent and much more serious in their results than they are in the modern Church of England. The Archbishop of Malines kept a prison and guards, and the bodily safety as well as the office of individuals was at stake. In this treatise Van Espen, as well as insisting upon the inalienable right of the prince to assure the safety of his subjects, points out that most of the precautions designed by the early Church to avoid or to correct miscarriages of justice have fallen into disuse. They were mostly provisions for synodical action, but now bishops act alone or through their officials in absolving or imposing censures. Van Espen had cause to know through the misfortunes of his friends, and finally through his own, how the hostility of a bishop or archbishop could lead ecclesiastical officials to the violation of the first principles of justice. He saw the only hope of safety in appealing to the royal protection and in demanding that the due processes of law be always followed. His story in this respect is one which Anglicans would do well to consider.

Professor Van Hove, one of Van Espen's modern successors at Louvain, says of him, after paying tribute to his scholarship: "On the other hand he was a strenuous defender of the Gallican theories. He misconstrued the right of religious authority and exaggerated beyond measure the right of the civil power. It may be added, however, that he exalted and combated in turn all power, even the civil power. He exalted the power of the bishops in order to lessen that of the religious orders, and the rights of an extinct chapter in order to combat the power of the Pope. He gained for himself unpleasant notoriety in the Jansenist conflicts, by denying the importance of the famous distinction between right and fact with regard to the doctrine of Jansen; he declared that it was of little consequence to admit that Jansen had taught the propositions condemned by the Bull *Unigenitus* (1713) provided that the doctrine itself was rejected."[1] This highly unsympathetic reference by a distinguished contemporary canonist shows the extent to which Van Espen's opponents have triumphed in the Roman Church. It is our hope that these two articles may have indi-

[1] *Catholic Encyclopædia*, vol. v, Article "Espen," p. 541.

cated how unjust as well as unsympathetic Van Hove's judgment is. Fundamentally Van Espen's appeal was the same as that of the Church of England, to Scripture, to the Primitive Church, and to a reasonable and informed historical criticism, and for this as well as for his defence of our sister Church of Utrecht he deserves to be commemorated. Those who are undertaking the revival of Canon Law studies in the Church of England could do worse than to take Van Espen as their starting-point, for in him they will find clarity and profundity combined, and he himself has indicated the spirit in which the work should be undertaken: "This thing alone I ask, that in my writings as in those of others whom I have quoted the saying of the Apostle should be observed, 'Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.' "

ERIC KEMP.

The Cell and the Church

DURING the crisis which preceded the last war, while secularists were seeking a sovereign cure for the ills of the world, a few Christians felt the need of deepening and strengthening their faith and formed small groups, joining regularly in prayer and conversation. How far the formation of these groups took place under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit we may consider later on. For the present, we should merely state the facts, as far as they can be ascertained from very inadequate and scattered information.

However incomplete, these facts allow us to outline the main characteristics of the movement. It sprang spontaneously from the laity, particularly among adults, and worked from its origin through small units of five to twelve members, any increase in numbers bringing about the formation of a new unit, not the enlargement of the first. For this and for other reasons, the groups were soon known as Christian cells.[1] They shunned publicity and relied on the personal relationship established between men brought together by the work on which they were engaged, or because they happened to live in the same place. It is difficult to say whether the first cells, in this country, were vocational or residential. Both seem to have grown out of a genuine desire, on the part of Christians who felt isolated and lonely, to share the same sufferings and the same hopes in an intimate fellowship.

Apart from insistence on regular attendance, and the selection of a leader and of a meeting-place, the first cells did not adopt any rule or statute,[2] neither did they endeavour to recruit new members through publicity. It would have been difficult for them to do so because their character varied from one district to another; some of them being interdenominational, others restricted to members of the Church of

[1] In answer to the challenge of Communist "cells"? Or because the use of the word "group" would have suggested some connexion with the "Oxford Group," a movement of a very different character? The connexion between the Christian cells and the "body of Christ" seems to have been made more recently.

[2] Up to the present, the companies known as "The Servants of Christ the King" are the only ones that pledge themselves to follow a "rule of life."

Meetings generally take place in the houses of members, not in the church hall.

England; some of them including men only, others men and women, or women only; some of them devoting most of their time to prayer, others to study or to some common activity connected with the Church. There seems to have been a tacit agreement that, if any change had to take place, it would arise naturally from the development of the cell itself. It is not easy to determine whether this attitude was due to the members' desire of preserving complete control over their own group or to their wish to "wait upon the Holy Ghost." No doubt, in most cases, the spirit of independence and the mystical motive were closely associated. What may be said is that the members found in their regular meetings a new strength and a new hope, something which neither their individual prayers nor their attendance at Church services had hitherto given them.[1]

The need of a closer fellowship between the members of the same congregation had for a long time been felt both by the laity and the clergy. Most Christians understand that individual prayers have only an individual value and that corporate worship alone can bring the congregation together under God; but corporate worship is apt to become conventional if the congregation is not linked together by some personal bond. You need a considerable experience in prayer to succeed in breaking the barrier of indifference which separates you from the man or the woman who kneels beside you in church. Besides, under modern conditions, with a constantly shifting population, a large number of Christians are not able to worship together in the same place for a long time. Efforts had been made before to break the ice between the members of the same congregation and between the laity and the clergy. Many "fellowships" had been organized which brought, it is true, a certain familiarity and heartiness in Church relationship but did not seriously alter its superficial character. It was generally assumed that, since the last thing Christians wished to talk about was their faith, the best way to bring them together was to give them an opportunity of joining in sports, dances, or other social activities. These various modes of relaxation, although perfectly innocent in themselves, could not obviously bring people together under God and under the Church. They began to know each other by name, but they were as far apart in their religious life as before. As far as the faith was concerned, the priest remained in his pulpit and the layman in his pew. When Church-people met, they showed their concern for their health or for the weather, but they were as reluctant as ever to show some concern for God or for His Church.

What the founders of the first cells discovered, without being clearly conscious of the discovery, was a spiritual instrument which, for the first time, brought together people of different social surroundings and different education, and removed the obstacles which separated them. The same instrument broke the barriers of self-consciousness and shyness which prevented them from talking about their faith. And because,

[1] It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader that the number of weekly communicants in the average parish is very small, and that many men and women find it difficult to take their Communion regularly, owing to the work upon which they are engaged.

contrary to expectation, this faith was precisely the thing which concerned them most in the world—far more than fiction, the pictures, and crossword puzzles—the discovery provoked a welcome release of affection and energy. Men who had hitherto been associated with the Church by tradition saw the true meaning of what they had been saying and doing so often without realizing the importance of their words and actions. Men who had concentrated on private devotion saw that sharing their prayers and meditations with others multiplied their power and gave them a simplicity, a humility, which no solitary devotion could give. Men who believed that, in order to be a good Christian, it was enough to lead a decent life and to conform to a certain moral code saw that the root of righteousness is in charity and that the love of God can only be lived in the love of neighbour taken literally, the love of each individual included in this small band of brothers which God had given him, the same Tom, Dick, and Harry whom they had never met before or whom they had only greeted casually. Such was the discovery these Christians made, the discovery that, beside the room where they said their prayers, when they said them, and beside the parish church where they attended service, when they attended it, there was something else, something at once larger and smaller, more generous and more intimate, a place where "two or three are gathered together."[1]

As the movement grew in importance and found new outlets in the war services, in the workshops, and in the parishes, the clergy began to take a keen interest in it. The late Archbishop Lord Lang approved the appointment of an Advisory Group to encourage its development; various companies joined under a common rule or leadership, and the idea gradually emerged that the Christian cells might become one of the best means of evangelizing an unchristian world. This idea has found concrete expression in the 1945 Report (*Towards the Conversion of England*) which refers to the cell movement as "the most effective instrument for evangelism under modern conditions." This statement may appear exaggerated to those who are inclined to judge religious activity by concrete results and official statistics. It is nevertheless strengthened if we remember that the influence of small groups of worshippers has always been essential to the life of the Church and that their absence has largely contributed to its present weakness.

If one thing appears clearly from the reading of the Gospels, it is that our Lord, when He established His Church in the world, made a strong distinction between the crowd which was stirred by the signs He gave them and by the power of His preaching, and the few disciples whom He chose one by one, to whom He gradually revealed the purpose of His mission, and to whom He entrusted the work of evangelization. If we consider the small group gathered in the upper room or cenacle, we may say that these few men and women who had shared their Lord's thoughts and enjoyed His confidence were specially

[1] I am quite aware that these words are generally applied to the congregation, but, to-day, a good congregation needs the strengthening influence of cell work,

equipped to realize the miracle of His Resurrection and to meet Him when He appeared to them after His death. We may add that they were destined to receive the visitation of the Holy Spirit because they had been prepared by Jesus Christ to receive it and to be transformed by it. For these reasons, the small group appeared and still appears as the necessary instrument of divine will.

The cell method has been called "St Paul's method" or the "apostolic method." This statement must be accepted with reservation because, in the Acts and the Epistles, we find that the appeal is directed both to the crowd and to the individual, and that, if some early churches include only a small number of converts, others include a "multitude" of them—that is, hundreds and even thousands. It is nevertheless evident that St Paul, in his restless life, never prolonged unduly his stay in the same place, even if that place was full of promise. He allowed others to complete the work he had begun and sought fresh ground, scattering his churches over a wide field. These churches, or *ecclesiæ*, were sometimes exceedingly small, including the "household" and the friends of the householder. They were, in fact, domestic *ecclesiæ*. "Important persons who had become Christians . . . allowed the large hall . . . often attached to (or included in) the larger sort of private houses, to be used as places of meeting, whether for worship or for other affairs of the community." Moreover, this occurred even among larger Christian communities, so that "the Ecclesia in the house of this or that man would seem to mean that particular assemblage of Christians, out of the Christians of the whole city, which was accustomed to meet under one roof."[1]

Without exaggerating the importance given to the catacombs as places of refuge in times of persecution, it is generally agreed that the leaders of the Church were frequently compelled to use Christian cemeteries and other hiding-places, where they were sought by a few faithful Christians who carried their messages to the brethren. The effect of persecution, from Nero to Hitler, has always been to split the congregations into small groups. Recent history shows that it is not always necessary to hide in caves or catacombs in order to "go underground," but it is necessary to divide the community into small units in order to forestall mass arrests. The first effect of this division is to harden the core of resistance.

But the cell method has not only been used to spread the Gospel and to overcome persecution. It has frequently been used to protect the Church from its own abuses when it became too closely associated with the affairs of the world. The great monastic orders which preserved civilization during the Dark Ages, and later reformed the Church from within, were not initiated by popes or bishops or by

[1] Hort: *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 118. Among these hosts, Hort quotes Aquila and Priscilla at Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi, 19) and at Rome (Rom. xvi, 5), Nymphas at Colosse (Col. iv, 15) and Philemon also at Colosse (Philem. 2). See also Latourette: "Some professional missionaries there were—apostles, prophets and teachers—but we gather that much of the work of conversion was done as an incidental part of the day's duties either by lay folk or by the clergy. Most of the converts came in one by one or in small family groups" (*A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, i, p. 169).

popular movements. Their inspiration was neither theocratic nor demagogic, neither authoritarian nor revolutionary. They began as small groups of men or women pledging themselves to follow a new discipline of life in a Church which was more and more absorbed by worldly interest. Benedict set himself "to institute a school for the service of God, in which the inmates were to share the sufferings of Christ and deserve to be partakers of His Kingdom." Bernard started his work at Clairvaux at the head of a small company of twelve, detached from Cîteaux. Francis and his "three companions" had even more modest beginnings. The small monastery of the Carcere founded by Bernardino da Siena in the fifteenth century, among the caves of the Subasio, where his master sought refuge after being expelled from Assisi, stands to this day as a monument of Franciscan humility. It can barely accommodate twelve friars.

The history of the Church appears as a succession of progress and regress, which should not be valued in numbers, but in quality. Each temporal success involves a spiritual failure; the greatest victories were won by small minorities against the indifference or the hostility of the world. We may therefore be justified in asking ourselves whether the present movement which binds together small groups of Christians within the Churches, and more particularly within the Anglican community, is not based on a long-standing tradition and prompted by the same Spirit which again and again saved the Catholic Church from moral defeat, and whether the "discovery" made in the dark days of 1938-40 was not, in fact, the rediscovery of a gift of God which, although constantly accessible, only appears to the imperfect mind of man whenever the threat of danger and the pangs of suffering, by increasing his sensitivity, enable him to tear the veil behind which it is hidden.[1]

The method is not new, but the circumstances in which it is used are without precedent. It would therefore be dangerous to draw rash conclusions from historic analogies and to declare that the Church should at once propagate the cell movement, enlist new members, and place them under the strict control of ecclesiastical authority. Nothing would more efficiently nip in the bud all future hope of fruitful expansion.

The world of secularized religion in which St Francis worked in the thirteenth century was very different from the pagan world in which St Paul worked in the first, and still more different from the world of secularism and humanism in which we find ourselves immersed to-day. Our scattered and divided Christian community is faced neither with idolatry nor with apostasy, but with nihilism, the blank assertion that any supernatural religion has become irrelevant and has no longer any part to play in social life. On the other hand, the Church to-day suffers, not so much from lack of numbers, as from lack of cohesion.

[1] It does not follow that the cell technique is an unfailing guarantee of success. Pharisees may use it as well as Christians. Safety never lies in numbers large or small, but the few and the weak are less exposed to temptation than the many and the strong.

The clergy has, to a great extent, lost touch with the laity and the laity has ceased to consider itself as an integral part of the Church.

The great service rendered by the 1945 Report is the prominence it gives to the responsibility of the whole Church. It has been rightly considered as an appeal to the laity and many laymen have already answered it. If this cell movement is really a gift of God, it may play a very important part in the near future, but it can only play this part if the gift is received in a spirit of reverence and gratitude. It is not something to be used for any purpose, even for the purpose of evangelism.[1] It is something to be tended, protected, encouraged, a seedling to be nursed, not a hedge to be trimmed or a tree to be pruned. It will need a great deal of patience to cultivate the plant until the time comes to gather its fruit. There will be a good deal of tension between the efficient organizer, eager to obtain quick results, and the contemplative mystic, often inclined to sacrifice action to the prayer which should prompt action. There will be further tension between the clergy, professionally trained to provide ready answers, and the laymen who might feel inclined to question these answers. There will be theological difficulties, pastoral difficulties, denominational difficulties. The safest approach to all these problems seems to be to bring the influence of the Holy Spirit to bear upon the movement as a whole and upon any decisions made to support it.

This involves the sacrifice, on the part of the clergy, of any intention they may have of using the cells as one more weapon in their armoury and, on the part of the laity, of any temptation to depart from the doctrine of the Church in order to further some ideal of their own. It involves also a common determination not to alter the present unobtrusive character of the movement by advertising it or turning upon it the blinding searchlight of propaganda. Those who have any experience of cell work know how sensitive it is to outside influence. Whether you talk together or discuss together or pray together, all depends on the togetherness. A newcomer is often apt to strike a discordant note, by being too loud, or too argumentative, even too fervent, but if he is the right kind of cell worker—if he comes to serve God without any idea of deriving any advantage from his fellow-workers or of conferring any benefit upon them—he will soon be absorbed in the atmosphere of the meeting and "catch the good contagion." Cells grow through a mutual understanding between a few friends; they multiply through the same kind of understanding based on a common faith and on a common love. The quality of the cell depends on the quality of that faith and love which is always exposed, from the inside, to a narrow exclusiveness, and, from the outside, to the intrusion of some uncongenial element. That is the reason why so many members will tell you: "The less you talk about it, the better for us." They wonder sometimes whether it may not be wiser to keep their discovery to themselves than to share it with others. But secrecy is as dangerous as publicity; for

[1] We should therefore avoid any comparison between the Christian cells and the Communistic cells. The Christian faith is not a political creed; evangelization is not propaganda. Disinterestedness is the first condition of spiritual success. For the part played by the laity in evangelism, see the 1945 Report, pp. 50, 51.

this kind of secrecy leads to spiritual pride as surely as publicity leads to immature action and emotionalism. It seems as if discretion and tolerance should guide those who attempt to encourage the movement. They should combine the "wisdom of the serpent" with the "harmlessness of the dove," be slow to criticize slight mistakes and quick to appreciate all genuine efforts, be careful not to restrict the field of action by playing for safety, and not to foster the growth of tares by promiscuous enthusiasm. In short, the whole movement should be treated in the same spirit as each group is being treated by those who are bound to it, as a small corporate unit in a larger corporate unit, as a small living organism in the living organism of the Church, as a cell in the body of Christ.[1]

EMILE CAMMAERTS.

Epigrams

THE Rock in Jesus in himself is clay
And weeps full bitterly
That faster than the cock declares the day
He does his God deny.

* * * * *

Foxes have holes, and birds (their Maker said)
Have nests, but I nowhere to lay my head.
Our greater Jacob, hunted and alone,
He made his pillows of the granite-stone.
So sepulchred, he saw a glory rise
Stair upon stair above his sleeping eyes;
Angels trod up and down the slanting beam.
At dawn he rose, and it was not a dream.

AUSTIN FARRER.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. L. J. Collins is Fellow and Dean of Oriel College, Oxford.

The Rev. Eric Kemp is Fellow and Chaplain of Exeter College, Oxford.

Mr Emile Cammaerts is the author of *The Flower of Grass*, etc.

Dr Farrer is Fellow and Chaplain of Trinity College, Oxford.

[1] The relationship of the clergy and laity in the movement should be examined separately. All through this article, I assume that laymen, in the cells, are loyal to their Church and therefore obedient to their pastor. But I also suggest that, in accordance with the advice given in the Report, members of the clergy who wish to help the movement actively should belong to it and enter into its spirit. Membership in a clerical cell might be a good preparation.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE STUDY OF HEBREW

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Two experiences during this past week-end have prompted me to write this letter. I believe I am right in addressing it to you, for I think the matter will be taken seriously, as I mean it to be, by readers of THEOLOGY, whereas readers of a more general paper might, some of them, think I was merely advertising a dispensable side-show. I want to renew a plea for the inclusion of a study of Hebrew in the course of the average ordinand in Britain.

1. Most weeks for the past three months I have been spending an hour or two in discussion with Prof. Martin Buber, of the Hebrew University here. Last Saturday we got on to the importance of a knowledge of the original languages for any true and intimate understanding of the Bible. And he was astounded when I told him—and I don't think I exaggerated—that I doubted whether more than 1 per cent. of Anglican ordinands in Britain took Hebrew as part of their training. "But how can they understand the O.T.?" he asked. "How could I possibly understand the N.T. unless I were able to read it in Greek—and," he added, "without a knowledge of Hebrew as well?" And he reached down to a lower shelf of his desk and brought out a Greek Testament. "Look at John iii, 8," he said. "What does your English version say?" And I quoted, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, . . ." "How can you understand the force of that," he went on, "without reference to the original Greek, and even behind that to the Hebrew of Genesis i, 2, which must have been in the mind of Jesus as He spoke those words? Without a knowledge of Greek the reader misses the fact that both noun and verb are from the same root, πνεῦμα πνεῖ, and without a knowledge of Hebrew he cannot see how inadequately the Greek renders the assonance of the רוח מרחפת of Genesis. Moreover, in English the reader does not realize that the words for 'wind 'and 'spirit' in this same verse (John iii, 8) are identical, as they are of course in both Greek and Hebrew. . . ." This is only one of many such examples that might be cited, where the true force and meaning of the Bible can only be understood by reference to the original languages. And Prof. Buber further insisted that the Bible ought to be read aloud, even by the solitary reader, if the words are to be understood as they were first spoken; they must be heard, and not simply by the mental but also by the physical ear. This means that it is not enough for the ordinand, or the ordained man, to be able to consult what George Herbert called "commenters and fathers"; he should be able to do this kind of reading and hearing the Bible himself.

2. After expressing myself about this to one of my colleagues here, I was shown by him an article in *The Living Church* for January 20, 1946, entitled "The Church and the Seminary," and written by a former member of the staff of one of the Anglican seminaries in America. This was a forceful appeal for the better and more thorough training of the Church's clergy. No novel appeal, indeed, for I myself can

remember the warden of the theological college where I worked before coming out here making a similar impassioned appeal on more than one occasion, and no doubt other instances could be given. But one of the points Chaplain Myers emphasizes is that the clergy should be men of real learning and sound doctrine. Although he does not touch upon actual curriculum subjects, surely the proper study of the Bible ought to be accompanied by an adequate study of its original tongues, of which Hebrew is one.

I am well aware that this matter has been brought up before, and is, I believe, even now being considered by the Anglican Central Advisory Council for Training Candidates for the Ministry. In the Anglican Church in America, I am told, the percentage of those who take Hebrew in their courses is about 50. I am not unmindful of the fact that there are some, though not many, of the clergy who, with little encouragement from others but with great profit to themselves and their understanding and presentation of the Gospel, have pursued the beginnings of Hebrew acquired at the university or theological college. My first vicar was proud to tell me during the first year I was in the parish that he had just finished reading the whole O.T. in Hebrew, a task which he had set himself after his ordination.

I am aware also that in some non-Anglican communities, notably the Church of Rome, the Church of Scotland, and some of the Nonconformist denominations, it is the exception rather than the rule for an ordinand to omit altogether the study of Hebrew.

But look at the care and detail with which the rabbinical ordinand is expected to study his Scriptures before he can be regarded as fit to lead his community. Hebrew is for him, of course, not only the language of the O.T., but also of his liturgy, and maybe of daily parlance. But the minister of the Christian Gospel ought surely to be acquainted with the language which our Lord knew from childhood and in which He almost certainly spoke many of His sacred words. This is particularly evident to me here as I study at close quarters Jewish-Christian relations.

There are many practical difficulties, it cannot be denied. It would, for example, probably be impossible to staff all Anglican theological colleges immediately with Hebrew instructors. But most of the universities where ordinands begin their studies have someone competent to set their feet on the right way; and in a comparatively short time, especially if the Hebrew paper in the General Ordination Examination became not the optional, rarely taken, extra, but the regular thing, then clergy would materialize who would be able to pass on their knowledge to their brethren. There is the difficulty arising from the fact that Greek and Latin have also to be learned; I personally would prefer to see the two Bible languages, Hebrew and Greek, studied, and Latin dropped if necessary, although it is certainly desirable that the clergy should be acquainted with all three. Are they not, after all, as necessary to the expert minister of God's Word and Sacraments as a knowledge of anatomy or hygiene to the good doctor? It might mean a slight lengthening of the period of training. But this has already been recognized as a necessity, and has been recom-

mended in Anglican circles, where the need is greatest and where it has been realized at last that it is wiser to have fewer better trained and properly qualified clergy than more poorly equipped and consequently ineffectual men. Here is something we have to learn from our Roman Catholic brethren. Even for their secular priesthood their training takes at least seven years from matriculation, and so there is time for most of their ordinands to include Hebrew in their studies.

So, at this juncture in the history of the Church, when it is vital above all else that we should have Christian leaders who will be respected both within the Church and without for their learning and godly conversation, let us make due provision for their full and thorough training.

C. Witton-Davies.

St George's Close,
Jerusalem.

THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND AND IN INDIA

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

May I, as a priest just returned from India, with longer service there and shall I say a much more "Western" point of view than Canon Peacey, say that I absolutely agree with what he has said in his letter in May Theology about the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon? I think he ought to have said also that Kelham has shown restraint and charity as much as have the Oxford Mission and Cowley Fathers in India.

The Church of India is Catholic compared to the Church of England; it has to face in the very near future hostility, if not persecution, from the Government. Its existence depends on its being united with all who believe that salvation is only in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. There are things in the form reunion is taking which I feel are mistaken, but then Andrew Molony is rather an ignorant priest, and I have at least faith enough to believe that our dear Redeemer will take and make something very wonderful and beautiful out of this act of courage and love for our fellow-Christians on the part of the C.I.B.C.

Yours, etc.,

Andrew Molony.

At West Acklam Vicarage,
Middlesbrough.

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Canon Peacey's indignant outburst on "the disintegration manifest in the Church of England" expresses something of what is felt by most priests in England returned from missionary or other overseas ministry. We find ourselves aliens, cut off by some unseen barrier from our brother priests and still more from our diocesan bishops, chilled by the cold, dead Christian community, shocked by the unfriendly and aloof clergy and depressed as we gradually grasp the different standard of importance of things here. In the course of five years' peripatetic ministry in most dioceses of Canterbury and York I

can scarcely recall a single priest from overseas who did not share my dismay. The whole conception of the Church, of the relations of clergy to bishops, of laity to clergy, is in theory the same in England as in other Anglican provinces, but in practice works out to a different result. Experience of the Church of the province of India, Burma and Ceylon (C.I.B.C.) and of the Church of the provinces of Canterbury and York (C. of E.) leaves no doubt which Church is deficient, for "by their fruits ye shall know them." But how to "tell those things which" we "have seen and heard" to those who have only experienced C. of E. we do not know.

The Church we have left—C.I.B.C.—is an organic unity, a living fellowship with a rich sense of community and a quality of life that we seek here and do not find. What the champions of apostolic succession claim for it, that in actual experience we find in C.I.B.C. and miss in C. of E. The schismatic protestant groups of Europe in cutting themselves off from the succession found, we are told, that they had lost Christian unity and gained a principle of fissiparous disintegration: which is what we find in C. of E. and do not find in C.I.B.C. The Bishops in India are united and coherent, loved, respected and obeyed. Who will assert that any of these virtues attach to their lordships of Canterbury and York?

The East has retained—so far, but our civilization has made successful attacks upon it—the natural human sense of community which has faded in England. C.I.B.C. shares this sense, which is a basic constituent of its mental and spiritual atmosphere. In C. of E. there is much intellectual construction—how much of it pre-fab. I am unable to say—in artificial isolation from its anæmic life and unrelated to its actual structure and barren and unproductive in effect. From such a quarter criticism of C.I.B.C. begins necessarily in ignorance of the constituent elements of that province's spiritual life. English critics assume in India those predisposing causes which obtain in England, and predict lamentable results. But such causes lie largely below the surface of conscious apprehension both in India and in England. Those which obtain in India and those which obtain in England cannot possibly be identical, and indeed are not; I have given one particular only. Thus the English argument is vitiated from the start; it involves, I suppose, the fallacy of four terms, and however valid the logic and sound the dogmatic construction the conclusion is faulty.

What could we say of the pride of a Church if, claiming the name and the pretensions but lacking in its life the marks of an episcopally ordered society, it presumed to anathematize a Church whose life displays those marks? What could we do in a Church, itself decadent by every test, if it were so blind and complacent as to sit in judgment on a Church which by the same tests is alive and stirring?

"They answered and said unto Him, Our father is Abraham . . . Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind ye would have no sin: but now ye say, We see: your sin remaineth."

I am, Sir,
Yours, etc.,
C. K. Hughes.

At the Vicarage,
Berwick-on-Tweed.
June 14, 1946.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Your correspondents have, I think, misunderstood me. Nowhere in my letter to you did I complain of criticism of the S.I.U. Scheme. Dom Gregory Dix's assertion that I wish to "deny to the religious the right to make their convictions heard" and that I "abuse them for having consciences" is not true of myself or of anyone else. We have been encouraging criticism in India for twenty years, and it is still welcomed.

What I did criticize was the organized propaganda against the scheme in this country and the constant suspicion and exaggeration in so many statements of the scheme's opponents—a very different matter.

An example of this is given in Mr Bentley's charge that the scheme "makes each and every clause of the Creed optional." It does not occur to him that the non-Anglicans by means of the footnote are merely demanding, in the interest of sincerity and honesty, a "reasonable liberty of interpretation," which Anglicans already take. In face of the statement on p. 27 that the Church "accepts the Apostles' Creed and the Creed commonly called the Nicene as witnessing to and safeguarding the faith," and the instruction on p. 43 that they shall be used "as the basis of part of the instruction" for baptism, and the demand on p. 54 that every deacon shall "affirm his sincere belief in the truths witnessed to by the Nicene Creed," is such a statement even attempting to be fair or to understand the other side? Many similar statements, some by religious, could be quoted.

Similarly, Mr Willis complains that episcopacy is "nowhere defined." What definition would he suggest more complete than that the bishop "has the general pastoral oversight of all Christian people of the diocese" . . ., "is chief shepherd under Christ of His flock" . . ., has "the responsibility of publicly stating . . . the doctrine of the Church universal as understood by the S. India Church," will "accept candidates for ordination and will ordain them" as well as having primary responsibility in evangelism, worship and discipline (pp. 44-46)? Once a bishop, he is always a bishop. "The Church accepts and will maintain the historic episcopate in a constitutional form" (p. 31), and his position does not seem to me to be "so insecure" because upon the initiative of the chief bishop he can be forced to resign if "judged mentally, physically or otherwise incapable of discharging the duties of his office" (p. 47) or sentenced by a court consisting of 3 bishops, 2 clergy and 2 laymen (presumably both legal experts) (p. 77). It is necessary to quote, because so many people simply judge by strong assertions like Mr Willis's.

Perhaps even more noticeable is the lack of imagination, which complains because the recitation of creeds is not made compulsory or a fixed Prayer Book insisted on from the outset in congregations which have never been accustomed to either. It was just such insistence by Archbishop Laud on a foreign form of worship which lost Scotland to

the Catholic Church. Is not the wiser way that of letting the blessing of set forms of worship make its own appeal?

There are two further matters raised by Dom Gregory Dix. The first is a selection of letters received from those who fear the worst from the scheme. Of course, there must be some such. But the answer to Dom Gregory Dix's three letters from India is that the scheme was passed by the General Council by a majority of 78 per cent. and that the voting in the dioceses concerned, each with 100 or more members, was —Dornakal, Tinnevelly, and Travancore *nem. con.* and Madras by 81 per cent. In three of these dioceses there are S.P.G. missionaries; and religious were among its supporters. Similarly the individual expressions of opinion of the bishops and missionaries from oversea Churches should be viewed in the setting of the official answers received from different Provinces. Not all of these had arrived at the time of the General Council, but of those which had come only one suggested even the possibility of breaking off communion with the C.I.B.C.

The matter of "conscience" which Dom Gregory Dix raises is indeed a serious one. I can assure him that I have not the slightest desire to "force" the issue, and the patience of the C.I.B.C., largely through the inspiration of the late Metropolitan, has been, and will, I am sure, continue to be, exemplary. But surely Dom Gregory Dix should first address his "little point of self-examination" to those who by fighting for the victory of their own point of view, which is less than that of the whole Church of England, whether by organizing a society for defending Church principles or by party trusts, which I equally with Dom Gregory Dix deplore, are heading our Church for schism. Evangelical and Catholic are surely only complete when in union. It would indeed be a tragedy if a single one of these religious should commit schism.

For my part I cannot understand why they need take such a step because a younger Church in all good faith has allowed some of its members, who will not be in communion with them, to make a venture in the cause of unity which it believes that Christ wills. If this principle were adopted by all, ought not the younger Churches to leave the Church because the Church of England received its Prayer Book from Parliament and the King appoints its bishops? Where would it end? Are Evangelicals to commit schism if Benediction is given in Central Africa? At least Archbishop Temple could see no such necessity. Is not this the very schismatic, congregationalist, exclusive attitude which is the opposite to true Catholicism, and which is heading us for disaster?

But, further, is there any greater seriousness in the loss (which God forbid) of 100 religious or even 3,000 priests of the Church of England than in that of 50,000 or 100,000 or more members of the C.I.B.C.?

Supposing the Indian Government asks for the departure of all English bishops and missionaries, and persecution begins in earnest, is it likely that the village Christians of our Church in S. India will be able to hold together in isolation with no scheme? This "little point

of self-examination" should be addressed as soon and as earnestly as possible by Dom Gregory Dix to his correspondents and to the organizers of the opposition who are determined that there shall be no scheme except their views prevail. "What are" these villagers "to do if they find their conscience being forced," not "by a majority," as in his question, but by a minority of foreigners? It is indeed a terribly serious question for them to ask themselves, and will, I pray, persuade them to stop talking of schism and instead to allow to the S.I. Church the full latitude of catholicism which they themselves are content with in the C. of E.

And, for practice, let them draw up a scheme of reunion with any Nonconformist body and see if they can get the perfect wording, which no suspecting person will distrust. In any case it will be an education for them, and very constructive.

For the root of the matter is a difference of approach. In India Christians have grown up in different denominations for geographical and not for historical reasons. They have no fears or prejudices in their minds against their relatives in another denomination. The natural thing, they feel, would be to unite. Meanwhile the missionaries, working together, have largely shed their distrust and long to unite their heritages in one Catholic Church for the conversion of India. In that spirit the scheme was formulated. But as soon as it reached home it was viewed from a very different angle by those whose relationship with other denominations has been very different, and who have thus scrutinized with the microscope of denominational mistrust a scheme drawn up as a basis for growing together into the fullness of the faith. As a result there has been a steady deterioration not only in the scheme, but in the relations of those taking part in it, as every demand for a safeguard aroused a counter-suspicion. That is why I stressed so strongly that charity of mind and trust are needed. These Nonconformists want episcopacy and its blessings. What would our Lord's attitude be? Did the Council of Jerusalem demand complete acceptance of the traditional position? A hand of welcome will do a hundred times more to foster the Catholic faith and practice in India than an armoury of safeguards. In any case, safeguards are no protection. The only protection for the Catholic faith in the C. of E. or in the C.I.B.C. is that people love it.

As to Dr Jalland's question why the Baptists, Lutherans and Syrians are not in the scheme—the Syrians are unhappily fully occupied with their own dissensions; the Lutherans, having just formed an all-India Lutheran federation, do not feel at liberty to negotiate another union at the moment, but have sent observers; and the Baptists are in much the same position.

The purpose of my letter, however, was not to defend the scheme, but to ask for charity and loyalty in the C. of E. comparable to that in the C.I.B.C. and for a drive towards constitutional episcopacy not only abroad, but at home, an objective in which we should all be much more fruitfully occupied.

May I conclude by assuring Dom Gregory Dix that I owe more than I can say not only to ancient monks, but to the writings of modern

ones like Fr Benson, Fr Congreve, Fr Thornton, and Fr Hebert, as well as to the spiritual help of others?

Yours sincerely,
J. R. Peagey.

7A Great George Street,
Bristol, 1.
July 1, 1946.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Ministry of the Word. By F. D. Coggan.

Strange Victory (Holy Communion). By M. A. C. Warren.

The Book of Common Prayer. By D. E. W. Harrison.

St Paul's Library. The Canterbury Press. 6s. each.

St Paul's Library is a new series, sponsored by a Committee of leading Evangelicals in the Church of England, with a General Preface by the Bishop of Sodor and Man printed at the head of each book in the series. The avowed object of the Library is to present an integrated Evangelical theology in a popular form, in order to meet the current drift from Liberalism, which is described as "the recovery of a more definite and authoritarian tone in the presentation of the full Christian faith." This drift is "being exploited by the reactionary forces of Mediævalism and Ultramontanism," and also by the "unreasoning Conservatism" of the Barthians. Liberal Evangelicals must therefore endeavour to secure "a right proportion between Traditionalism and Liberalism." The Library will be welcomed with interest by all who share the Liberal Evangelical standpoint, and by all who wish to understand it better; by those who believe that party divisions in the Church of England are rapidly becoming meaningless; and by those who are still asking whether a synthesis between the "Catholic" tradition and "Justification by Faith Only" is really a possibility.

Dr Coggan's book is avowedly the publication of lectures on preaching, first delivered in Canada and then in England between 1943 and 1945, and is none the worse for that. It contains seven useful lectures on the Preaching of the Gospel, analysing the preaching of our Lord and His Apostles, and pleading for a return to such preaching in the modern pulpit. It may be read with profit by all preachers. Our only quarrel is with the title of the lectures, *The Ministry of the Word*, which would seem to limit that ministry to preaching. No doubt the Christian minister exercises the Ministry of the Word primarily in the pulpit. But there are many other occasions—in the giving of retreats or in the hearing of confessions—when he is charged with ministering the Word. It would be a pity if this Ministry were to be so narrowly defined as to exclude such occasions.

Mr Warren's book also suffers from its title, *Strange Victory*, but here the list of titles comes to our rescue, by printing *Holy Communion* in parentheses immediately after *Strange Victory*. It is an attempt to expound the Communion Service of 1661 by means of the theology of the Atonement set out by Dr Aulen in *Christus Victor*. One had thought

that the Evangelical doctrine of the Cross was one of Substitutionary Punishment. Here one is faced with a doctrine of Vicarious Victory. Such a return to the teaching of the Scriptures and the Fathers is very welcome. But the attempt to find the doctrine in the Service of 1661 is inevitably a failure.

The Archdeacon of Sheffield's book is at once the most interesting and the most irritating of the three—interesting because of the number of vital topics he begins to discuss, irritating because of the plan of the book, which prevents him from completing the discussion. One gets the impression that the author would very much like to talk about many burning questions connected with the worship of God, but has no time to do so, since he has to get all his readers through the Worship Paper of the G.O.E. on one term's lecturing. Why in a book of 140 pages try to cover the whole ground? Why waste time giving textbook information about the derivation of Morning and Evening Prayer from the medieval Choir Office, while devoting less than a page to discussing the nature of the Eucharistic Memorial? Those who hold a different view from the Archdeacon are not helped by such bare assertions as " 'Do this in remembrance of Me' must mean 'Do this as My memorial among yourselves'." And since "there is an all-important distinction between offering a sacrifice and pleading a sacrifice," might it not assist mutual understanding among Anglicans if one attempted to define the distinction? By far the most helpful chapter in the book is the first, which endeavours to set out the principles of Christian worship "in spirit and in truth," as found in the New Testament. Here a distinction is drawn, perhaps rightly, between two different ways of New Testament thinking, but the way associated principally with the Epistle to the Hebrews is simply declared to be "secondary." The whole cycle of teaching connected with the Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord is therefore practically set aside, and the "Catholic" approach to worship is declared to be difficult and uncongenial. But surely such selective handling of the New Testament is intolerable in these days. And surely the business of the Anglican theologian is rather to attempt to integrate both streams of New Testament teaching than to develop the congenial and neglect the uncongenial.

All three authors show a practical interest in Prayer-Book revision. All three desire the preaching of a sermon at the Communion Service, as indeed the present Prayer Book orders, while Dr Warren and Archdeacon Harrison show a new appreciation of the Offertory, and a new discomfort at the preoccupation of Anglican formularies with the Cross to the exclusion of the Resurrection. The Archdeacon presses for the restoration of the Communion as the principal Sunday service in Evangelical Churches, with a shortened form of the Litany and an Old Testament Lesson prefixed to the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel. But he is adamant over the sequence of Consecration, Communion, Oblation, and rigidly restricts the last to the self-oblation of the communicants. And he very wisely remarks of this sequence in the present English Rite that "it is only when it is compared with other rites, with other intentions, that it is judged to be 'gravely defective,' . . . and

those who dislike it really dislike the theology of the sacrament which it enshrines."

A. H. Couratin.

St Stephen's House,
Oxford.

Confirmation Today. An Address by L. S. Thornton, C.R. Dacre Press. 6d.

In an address to the Sacred Synod of the diocese of St Albans Dr Thornton criticizes the treatment of the doctrine of Confirmation in the document presented by the Convocation Committees under the title *Confirmation Today*. The writers of that document presupposed the later Western tradition, according to which Confirmation is not a sacrament of initiation but a sacrament of growth, and used that tradition as the starting-point for considering the possibility of a further development—namely, the postponing of Confirmation to a stage in the Christian life later than first communion. As to the particular significance of Confirmation they adopted the notion that it is "the layman's ordination."

Dr Thornton provides a very valuable exposure of the weakness of this treatment. He shows that the idea of the layman's ordination involves an impossible separation between *being* a layman and *doing* the office of a layman. It is to be hoped that Dr Thornton has given the *coup de grâce* to a misleading theory which R. C. Moberly criticized in *Ministerial Priesthood* (p. 262, 1907 edn.). Further, Dr Thornton shows the wrongness of using the developed doctrine of the West as a norm from which further development can be made instead of looking behind the Western development to the teaching of Scripture and the Fathers. If we do the latter we see clearly the *initiatory* character of Confirmation and the necessity of emphasizing its connexion with Baptism in our teaching notwithstanding the separation of the two rites in our practice.

It is therefore to Scripture that Dr Thornton directs us, and the latter half of his address is concerned with the evidence of Scripture. In particular he draws attention to the eschatological note which is present in the primitive sacramental teaching, the sealing unto the day of redemption, the unity of vocation and salvation as "two facets of one mystery, the mystery of our new creation in Christ." What he misses in the Convocation Committees' Report—and is it not missing far and wide in contemporary teaching?—is "the eschatological frame of reference which gave a mysterious unity to apostolic Christianity."

Dr Thornton's discussion of this aspect of the apostolic teaching is so illuminating that it is a pity that in his detailed treatment of the evidence he is content with some unconvincing bits of exegesis of the sort which he used in his pamphlet *The Judgment of Scripture, A Biblical Torch turned on the South India Scheme*. For example, it *may* be true that in Romans iv, 1-15 the justification of Abraham by faith and his subsequent circumcision as a seal of righteousness are intended to prefigure the baptism of converts and their subsequent sealing in

confirmation. But it is far from self-evident that Romans iv was written to set forth a pattern of Christian initiation. And it is to be noticed that in *The Common Life in the Body of Christ* Dr Thornton expounded this and other passages without any reference to Confirmation, so lacking in self-evidence is the point upon which he now insists. Again, the statement that in Ezekiel xxxvi, 24-28 "we see foreshadowed the Christian pattern of initiation" raises more questions than it answers. What is required is not a conviction that *we* see something in the Old Testament passage but clear evidence that the apostles saw it there and said so. For it is an *historical* question that Dr Thornton is discussing: what did the apostles believe and teach about the rites of baptism and the laying-on of hands? In examining this historical question it would be unscientific to ignore the place of typology in the method of the apostolic writers, and it is right to show us that their use of typology was greater than modern students have generally been ready to recognize. But when delicate questions of history are at stake no student with an historical conscience is ready to accept as evidence of the mind of the apostles a typological pattern thrown at him without demonstration that the apostles themselves used this pattern. Typological exegesis, like *Formgeschichte*, has limits to what it can do; and in his two pamphlets Dr Thornton seems to ignore entirely the question of where these limits lie.

A. M. Ramsey.

Durham.

Laodicea in the Twentieth Century. By Frank Bennett. S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d.

This little book, besides being readable and provocative, has the added merit of being good-tempered and humble.

The opening diagnosis seemed to me to concede too much to the fashionable blather about liberalism and diffused Christianity. Admittedly *anima naturaliter anglicana* is Pelagian. Was not the one large-scale revival in England Pelagian in flavour? But I cannot admit that the modern religious Englishman is in revolt against Christ though there is inevitably a good deal of agnosticism in his make-up. It is rather against parsons and priests that he is in revolt. For all our talk about κήρυγμα we are not commending the Gospel as the Christians of the first three centuries did; too few of the little communities that cluster round a parson or a priest commend the Gospel to their neighbourhood. Those that do evoke a response like rivers of water in a thirsty land. May it not be that the Englishman's faith is not dead but that it has gone underground, and clerical voices cannot easily call it out? If the passport to orthodoxy is to prefer an authoritative theology whose fruits are meagre to a science and technology whose achievements have been immense, he will pay his subscription and stay away hoping that presently a better lot will take our place.

I am also not sure that the layman's Christianity is diffused so much as inarticulate. Its quality is shown in the long fight back to victory over the tyrants of the West. If it is a diffused Christianity that produced that heroic morale and massive achievement in our people, let us have

some more of it in the Church of England, which does not seem able to reform itself. It may be accidental that its accent was that of liberalism. Time will show; but the fact should give pause to some of our authoritarians and make them think again if they can.

Having got that off, I can indeed applaud what Mr Bennett says about making our churches Christ-centred communities distinct from the world, not so much in their awareness of being apart, as in fact. Enough people are conscious that light and leaven are in short supply to recognize them when present, without our posting notices, The light is coming.

The warning in the last chapter against diverting loyalty from Church to church organizations is a nail truly hit. With local congregations often small in numbers there is less excuse for this diversion. The organizations, especially those on a sex basis, have had their day —a great day; to-morrow will be the day of the parish fellowship known in the breaking of bread, gathering in one both sexes, all ages and classes. *Pace* the increasing headquarters staff of these organizations, it is to the recreating of such apostolic fellowships and to the cleansing of our economy of the anomalies that hinder our communion in Christ that the main drive must be directed. LESLIE SHEFFIELD.

[This book is the first of three which S.P.C.K. are publishing in 1946, under their "Double Aim" scheme, whereby a subscriber of 5s. both gets three books and also makes possible their distribution overseas.]

MEN AT WORK. By G. Wilfred Davis. S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d.

MONEY IS STERILE. By G. Jansen, O.P. Blackfriars, Oxford. 1s.

As Christians look ahead, Mr Davis, the author of *Men at Work*, a small book in a "Reconstruction" series, thinks they should seek a true understanding of industry and its problems. In less than a hundred pages he gives a useful picture of the whole industrial structure for the general reader. He is aware, however, that Christians have, or should have, the sort of troubled conscience about social and industrial conditions which Bishop Gore provoked. He maintains therefore that they should see that Christianity and its principles form the foundation of industry. But lacking, as we all do, a competent Christian sociology, his attempts "to examine the present industrial structure from a Christian point of view" are somewhat superficial. But he does at least make the attempt.

With the general ethical principles laid down by St Thomas Aquinas as his foundation, Fr Jansen attempts a more profound analysis of the worlds of commerce and finance, within which industry operates. In his stimulating little thesis *Money is Sterile* he gives true value for money. He lays bare the field of banking and takes us into the lairs of the big-bad-wolf banks. There he finds the bankers serving the financiers of the world in their nefarious activity of creating credit and exploiting the simple saver whose purchasing power is depreciated. He shows how, when the financiers' plans go wrong, the Government raises the

bank rate to entice more money to the inflationary process. He demonstrates how, in modern times, money, which is essentially sterile, the function of which is to serve as a measure and a means of exchange, becomes the bride for which goods have to be bartered. He proposes, therefore, the control of banking, the abolition of credit creation, the limiting of investment to the ordinary share, and the restoration of the medieval conception of the gold standard.

Underlying his thesis Fr Jansen has a philosophy of economics. For him economics is basically a philosophic study, and, as such, part of ethics. It is essentially a study of relations: not only of production and consumption, but of the human needs satisfied thereby. The problems of economics are moral problems; its laws have to do with the fundamental nature of things; its true field is the field of human nature. Now these conceptions are not original; and those sharing in them have not been led to conclusions quite so naïve. The late Lord Keynes, for example, by general consent the world's leading economist, was no mean philosopher. He too saw the need for control in the field of finance, and worked for it. He detested unregulated capitalism. But he was a realist, as all reformers should be. And those who would reform the monetary system would do well to master, not only the complexities of the relation of production and consumption, but the complexities of ingrained habit in the consumers and producers. Fr Jansen's little work deserves close attention; but if it is not to be sterile, it should lead the reader himself to deeper study.

George Gibson.

Nuthurst.

Islam and Christian Theology. Part One. Volume I: Preparatory Historical Survey of the Early Period. By J. Windrow Sweetman. Lutterworth Press. 16s.

It is impossible to compare the beliefs of different religions unless the student tries to see the perspective from both sides. If both sides reason within different "universes of discourse," the misunderstanding which ensues nullifies the comparison. Mr Sweetman is fully alive to this difficulty, and quotes aptly the statement of an aged Muslim, "Until the theologians of both religions come together and speak with a common tongue, we must always be estranged." The most serious attacks on Christian doctrine are usually against beliefs which Christians themselves repudiate. Not many years ago Loofty Levonian attributed such misunderstanding to the fact that Islam interprets the spiritual in terms of the physical, whereas Christianity interprets the physical in terms of the spiritual.

Mr Sweetman, in the volume under review, in a very able and searching manner attempts to capture the right perspective for both Christian and Muslim by the historical method. If the Muslim point of view "is presented in a serious way, and shown in parallel to the progress of the human exposition within the Christian fold, the Muslim may perchance find the final statement more intelligible to him and relevant to the needs of his heart and soul when it cries out for the

Living God." The author also makes it clear that such an exposition as he gives, being a statement of anthropological phenomena, is not to be regarded as a criterion of judgment. His aim is only the attempt to gain the right perspective within the field of human ideas as they appear on the plane of history, in order to enable, if possible, the Muslim to appraise justly the Christian scheme of salvation.

This book is only the first of four volumes, so that at the moment we are only introduced to the early period of the interrelationship between Islam and Christianity. The evidence of the Qur'ān, Muslim tradition, and the Christian theological background is presented in a scholarly way with full documentary evidence. A second volume of origins is promised dealing with the theological position at the close of the period of Christian ascendancy in the Near East. A third volume will introduce the reader to the scholastic development, and a fourth will attempt a critical reconstruction.

Mr Sweetman opens with some fresh light on the position that pre-Islamic Arabia could not have been unaffected by Christianity, and points out that the Muslims began to learn the Greek sciences from their Christian subjects. Up to the first half of the ninth century the world outside Islam was on the whole more cultured, but the breaking out of narrow nationalisms among Christians and other non-Muslims contrasted with a broadening influence on the part of Islam with its great variety of racial elements, though "this was not before Christianity had had a decisive influence on the future of Muslim thought and particularly Muslim theology."

A detailed survey is made of ideas which cannot be attributed exclusively to Islam, the importance of which is relevant to the further comparative study of the theologies of Islam and Christianity. Much valuable material has been gathered together on religious narrative, worship, ritual, doctrine and law in the Qur'ān, followed by a section on tradition, all indicative of Christian influence at the source and during the period of the formulation of Muslim tradition. At first the influence was superficial, but as Islam developed the influence became profound and far-reaching.

The treatment of the Christian theological background which ensues is essential to a fair understanding of why the Muslim misinterpreted and still misinterprets to-day the heart of the Gospel, for his apologetic was formulated in antagonism to the form of Christianity with which he was familiar. The author surveys the schools of Alexandria, Cappadocia, and Antioch, the teaching of orthodox and heretical belief, the work of John of Damascus and the Christian Apologists of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries.

Section two treats of the introduction of philosophy into Islam. "It is remarkable how in Islam's earlier formative period, that religion took gifts which the Christian Church offered, and later at her zenith returned to Christian scholars of the Middle Ages what she owed . . . with an accumulated interest of doubtful value to Christianity as such, but a stimulus to thought, in the Renaissance, doubtless an enrichment." In order to enable the reader to form his own judgment on the treatment of the subjects dealt with by the religious philosophers,

Mr Sweetman gives a translation of the *Shorter Theology* of the Muslim *Ibn Miskawaih*. He thus provides the reader with a valuable insight into the debt of Islam to the past and with clues as to the nature of the Muslim influence on Jewry and Christianity in the future. But for more light on this, we await with expectancy the volumes yet to appear.

The present book is, without doubt, a valuable addition to the library of the student of the comparative study of religions, and augurs well for the future development of the author's theme—a picture of Christianity in true perspective from the Muslim viewpoint.

F. Harold Smith.

Chenies.

Preaching in the First Half-Century of New England History. By Babette May Levy. The American Society of Church History, Hartford, Connecticut. $3.00.

A revival in the study of the New England Puritans has taken place in recent years in America. It has done much to remove familiar misconceptions about them, although its findings have as yet had little opportunity of reaching many people in this country. The Pilgrim Fathers and their successors were not grim-visaged hot-gospellers who burnt witches for relaxation, nor were they starry-eyed visionaries who went westward where the land is bright in search of the Four Freedoms. They were fairly typical seventeenth-century Englishmen of a more religious and academic sort than most who embarked upon their incredibly hazardous and courageous enterprise with a fixed and definite idea in their minds. They would cross the sea to build a new England which should be a pattern and an example to the old England from which they set out of what a commonwealth reformed according to the Word of God should be. The history of their great experiment, and its virtual spiritual failure despite its material success, is therefore of the greatest significance for our understanding of our own history, and we need to study it as such.

Miss Levy's book is an account of a very important aspect of the life of early New England, its preaching. The sermon, as was to be expected, played a tremendous part in the life of the colony for both theological and social reasons, and Miss Levy has had a vast amount of material to wade through. She has contrived to produce out of it an interesting and readable book, which is free from the ponderous pomposity which normally disfigures American academic theses. A great deal of valuable material about the educational background and homiletical method and social context of the preachers is made available which is of general interest to all concerned with preaching to-day. The preachers emerge as sober and scholarly men, free from most of the excesses and eccentricities with which they are traditionally associated, who were desperately concerned that the saving truth of the Gospel should come home with power to the hearts and minds of their hearers in a situation of great peril and opportunity, but who

did not always succeed sufficiently in distinguishing between men's response to the Gospel and their response to their own sermons.

At the same time, this book loses as well as gains from being written from a historian's point of view. Miss Levy has a prejudice in favour of the "human interest angle" and does not always tell the theologian what he would like to know. We should have been grateful for a systematic account of the way in which these preachers handled the great Christian doctrines, of their methods of exegesis as well as their "plain style," and of their teaching and practice concerning the relation between preaching and the sacraments; but Miss Levy skates very lightly over these matters. If, however, anyone is fortunate enough to obtain a copy—and it is devoutly to be hoped that one of the first fruits of the American loan will be the renewal of intellectual commerce between our two countries—this book is well worth reading.

DANIEL JENKINS.

LONDON.

ANALECTA BOLLANDIANA. Tomus LXII. Revue Trimestrielle du Société des Bollandistes. Brussels, 1944.

John van Bolland (1596-1665) was entrusted by his superiors in the Society of Jesus with the task of completing the Lives of the Saints, begun in Antwerp by Heribert Rosweyde, S.J. (1569-1629). The result is the *Acta Sanctorum*, which Bolland began and his disciples completed. Each generation has furnished its three or four scholars to the company of hagiographers who, travelling among the libraries of Europe, copying and collecting manuscripts, have developed and handed on the tradition of exact, critical scholarship which still to-day widens and corrects our knowledge of the saints. The work of our own day is recorded in the quarterly review, the last published number of which is here noticed. Their publications came under the ban of the Spanish Inquisition from 1695 to 1715 because of a doubt cast upon Elijah's having founded the order of Carmelites. The Society escaped the general suppression of the Jesuits in 1773, but had hardly established itself in its new home in the abbey of Caudenberg, Brussels, when Von Kaunitz, in 1788, secured its dissolution by the Emperor Joseph II, on the grounds of the high cost of the work and the unlikelihood of its ever being finished. The library and equipment were sold, and what of the treasures was not concealed was dispersed, some never to be regained. But the work went on, the tradition was maintained; and Belgian fear lest the work, and the glory of it, should pass into the hands of the French, led in 1836-7 to the Fathers being re-established in the College of St Michael in Brussels. The first volume of the new series appeared in 1845; the review *Analecta Bollandiana* began in 1882.

Volume LXII contains the following articles:—Baudoin de Gaiffier: *Translations et Miracles de S. Mennas par Léon d'Ostie et Pierre du Mont Cassin.* St Mennas, a hermit of Italy, died 583; this account was occasioned by the translation of his relics, 1110. Paul Grosjean:

Analyse du Livre d'Armagh. A re-examination of the Patrician Documents, differing consciously from the work of John and E. F. Gwynn (*Liber Ardamachanus, etc.*, Dublin and London, 1913; *The Book of Armagh : The Patrician Documents*, Dublin, 1937). Paul Grosjean: *Notes sur les documents anciens concernant S. Patrice.* Stresses the need of a critical edition of all the texts concerning St Patrick. Paul Peeters: *Sainte Golindouch, martyre perse* († 13 juillet 591). An account of her life and passion, based on a comparison of authorities. Maurice Coens: *Anciennes litanies des saints (suite)*; an analysis of six sets of litanies from Northern France and Flanders. Ernest Stein: *Cyrille de Scythopolis : A propos de la nouvelle édition de ses œuvres.* A review of Ed. Schwartz, *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, Leipzig, 1939. François Halkin, *Saint Antoine le Jeune et Pétronas le vainqueur des Arabes en* 863 (*d'après un texte inédit*), and an edition of the Greek text in the National Library of Athens. Léon Halkin: *Lettres inédits du bollandiste Du Sollier à l'historien Schannat* (1721-1734) (*à suivre*).

There are also numerous reviews of recent hagiographical publications in Europe, including two articles by Prof. Bruce Dickens, *The Cult of St Olave in the British Isles*, in *Saga-Book of the Viking Society, XII ;* and *St Olave and the British Isles*, in *The Norseman*, II, 5. G. R. Dunstan.

Hawarden.

The Doctrine of the Unity of the Church in the Works of Khomyakov and Moehler. By Serge Bolshakoff. S.P.C.K. 18s.

The title of this book is not quite well chosen. It is a study of the life of Khomyakov and of his philosophical and religious thought, and especially of his ecclesiology, with reference to other thinkers who during his lifetime or afterwards crossed his path or discussed his ideas. The whole book is about Khomyakov, but only one chapter is about Moehler. Dr Bolshakoff is an industrious chronicler, and he has collected here a great deal of useful and suggestive information about Khomyakov himself and other theologians, mostly Russian.

Berdyaev has described Khomyakov as "a theologian of genius," and has said that in the nineteenth century he was "the greatest divine of the Orthodox East as another layman and essayist Joseph de Maistre was the greatest theologian in the Catholic West." The comparison, if not the estimate of greatness, is just. It was Khomyakov's distinction to think of the Church as a living organism as opposed to a legal institution, which he regarded as the error of Western Catholicism. For Anglicans special interest attaches to the fact that he developed his teaching about the nature of the Church in reply to William Palmer (of Magdalen) and as a criticism of the Tractarian branch theory. Dr Bolshakoff goes so far as to say that in this way the Oxford Movement influenced Eastern Orthodoxy.

In spite of the various contexts in which Dr Bolshakoff presents Khomyakov's teaching, that teaching does not in the end stand out as clearly as one could wish. He is rather too fond of saying that Khomyakov's teaching about this or that was good or masterly, but is not

altogether successful in explaining exactly what he taught. Nevertheless this is certainly a book which should be studied by all who are working on the doctrine of the Church, not least by those who are anxious to discover what Orthodoxy has to say to the West. In addition to Moehler, information is supplied about many other little-known ecclesiologists, which one would like to follow up. For instance, we should like to know more about Alexander Koshelev (see pp. 264*ff.*), whose teaching seems to have had the virtues without the limitations and exclusiveness of Khomyakov's. What this book shows is that there were in the nineteenth century many anticipations, disregarded or viewed with suspicion at the time, of ecclesiological doctrines which are gaining an ascendancy in the twentieth.

On p. 272 there is a sentence beginning "Khomyakov denied," which does not make sense.

A. R. VIDLER.

HAWARDEN.

NOTE.—Dr F. L. Cross has retired from the Advisory Committee of THEOLOGY. He has not been able to attend a meeting for a long time, but has continued to give epistolary help to which the Editor has been much indebted and upon which he hopes still to draw. The Rev. E. C. Ratcliff, Professor of Liturgical Theology in the University of London, and the Rev. W. W. S. March, Sub-Warden of King's College Hostel, have kindly consented to join the committee.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ANGLICAN PACIFIST FELLOWSHIP: Percy Hartill, *Article XXXVII and War* (6d.).

BURNS OATES AND WASHBOURNE: F. Copleston, S.J., *Arthur Schopenhauer* (12s. 6d.); C. Lattey, S.J., *Back to the Bible* (5s.).

C. OF E. ZENANA MISSIONARY SOCIETY: A. M. Robinson, *Prickly Pears* (3s. 6d.).

COUNCIL FOR CHURCH AND COUNTRYSIDE: *Occasional Paper, Rogationtide, 1946* (1s.); *A Service for Rogationtide* (2d.).

DOBSON: G. Bernanos, *Plea for Liberty* (8s. 6d.); J. Barker, C.R., *Yet Trouble Came* (1s. 6d.).

FABER AND FABER: M. C. D'Arcy, S.J., *The Mind and Heart of Love* (15s.).

NISBET: A. W. Hopkinson, *Mysticism Old and New* (7s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: H. H. Henson, *Bishoprick Papers* (16s.).

PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED PUBLISHING CO (U.S.A.): S. G. Craig, *Christianity Rightly So Called* ($2.00).

PRESS AND PUBLICATIONS BOARD: J. McLeod Campbell, *Christian History in the Making* (15s. 6d.).

RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE: *The Science of Relationships* (2s.).

SHEED AND WARD: Maisie Ward, *The Splendour of the Rosary* (12s. 6d.); D. J. B. Hawkins, *A Sketch of Mediæval Philosophy* (6s.); Dom R. Russell, O.S.B. (Ed.), *Essays in Reconstruction* (10s. 6d.).

SHELDON PRESS: R. R. Young, E. M. Rimmer and S. Anstey, *Literacy for Adults* (1s.).

S.P.C.K.: M. B. Reckitt, *The Christian in Politics* (3s. 6d.); A. Leigh, *The Child Jesus* (1s.); H. G. G. Herklots, *Grant us Thy Salvation* (1s.); P. S. Watson, *The State as a Servant of God* (4s.).

S.P.C.K. AND NATIONAL SOCIETY: Headmaster of Winchester, *A Schoolmaster to Parents* (2d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher